SUBJECT No. 82.

Appointment of a Commission for considering the condition of the Public Service.

Mr. H. Krishna Sastri Krishnarajapete Taluk.

Summary of Representation.—A Commission may be appointed for considering the condition of the Public Service with a view to ensure better efficiency of administration at minimum expenditure and to suggest means for establishing better relationship between the Government and the public.

Withdrawn.

SUBJECT No. 83.

Publication of a Hand Book in Kannada on the constitution of the Representative Assembly and citizenship.

Mr. R. opalaswamy Iyer, Bangalore City Municipality.

Summary of Representation.—(*a*) A handbook on the constitution of the Representative Assembly may be published in Kannada.

(*b*) Another handbook on the duties, rights and responsibilities of citizens may also be published in Kannada.

Withdrawn.

Discussion on the Rules of Debate in the Representative Assembly.

Mr. Ramachandra Rao Sindhe.—The rules of discussion recently issued by Government are probably responsible for the withdrawal of subjects by many of the members. Though the rules do not invest the President with any new or increased powers, yet the impression left on the minds of the members was that their freedom of speech was curtailed by the issue of the Rules. Without a notification of the kind in question, the President had all the powers necessary to preserve order in the Assembly and check irrelevance and repetition. It is not every member that is able to put forth his representation within a short time. The prescribing of a time limit will therefore act as a hardship in the case of several of the members. Every one of the members was always amenable to reason and always obedient to the President. There was therefore no necessity to pass a rule about preservation of order in the Assembly. It has caused considerable dissatisfaction among the members.

Mr. K. T. Seshaiya.—I generally endorse the views of Mr. Ramachandra Rao Sindhe. The Rules in question have no doubt caused some dissatisfaction among the members but there are other reasons which induced several members of the Assembly to withdraw the subjects that had been brought forward by them for discussion.

Dewan.—What other reasons?

Mr. Vema Reddy.—The time-limit prescribed in the Rules for each member desirous of speaking should be cancelled with a view to enable members to fully submit their representations. The rest of the Rules are alright.

Mr. Purushottama Anandagiri Gosai.—The rule which prescribes that "whenever in the opinion of the President a subject has been fully discussed, he may close all further discussion" seems to be somewhat arbitrary.

Mr. K. Subbaraya Setty.— All the powers specified in the order in question were in existence for over thirty years. There is therefore no reason why it should be objected to. Freedom of speech is not curtailed simply because there is a provision in the Rules about dealing with cases of disorderly conduct in the Assembly.

Mr. Mahomed Abbas Khan.—I agree with Mr. Subbaraya Setty in his views. Even in the British Parliament, there are similar powers to the President side by side with the freedom of speech. It is not fair that members should be discontented at these powers being merely defined. However, if there is reason for dissatisfaction, the rules might kindly be relaxed.

Mr. G. Paramasivaiya.—If members thought that the President sought to take more powers in the new Rules, I may point out to them that it is a mistake. All these rules have been in force for long; and members who have been in the Assembly since its inception would bear witness to it. If the powers that already existed have now been defined, it is to the members' own advantage in so far as they will be aware what exactly are the rules which should regulate their discussion. If any members are dissatisfied with the rules, it could be only such of them as would desire for liberty to act as they pleased. It does not look fair that, having the publication of certain rules as the main cause, members should withdraw the subjects proposed by them for discussion. They are not individuals come to the Assembly to submit personal grievances; but accredited representatives of several hundreds of His Highness's subjects and it will be a failure of duty if they withdrew the subjects. If their views had been submitted on the first day, certainly something could have been done. At any rate, to those to whom patriotism loomed supreme, there seemed to be no objectionable features in the new Rules and they had discussed their subjects fully. In these circumstances, there is absolutely no reason why the Rules should be withdrawn.

Dewan.—There was no intention whatever to take additional powers by means of the recent Rules of Debate. They were issued only to remind members of the rules already existing. There are rules to govern the conduct of the proceedings of all meetings. Members are at liberty to point out any objectionable features in the new Rules and Government will be glad to modify them if necessary. At any rate, in the original order which is in English, there appears to be no offensive language anywhere. Members might have been dissatisfied with the Kannada version of it. If this be the case, it might be due to the translation. The rules were in existence ever since the Assembly

was organized and the present attempt has been merely to reduce them to writing. The last rule under the heading 'Preservation of Order' was based on a ruling of the Government of India published in the Government of India Notification of September 1920. The rule runs as follows:—'The President shall preserve order and have all power necessary therefor. He may direct any member whose conduct is in his opinion grossly disorderly to withdraw immediately from the Chamber and any member so ordered to withdraw shall do so forthwith and shall absent himself for the remainder of the session.' This latter portion has not been adopted here. By checking grossly disorderly behaviour, it is not the intention to curtail freedom of speech. Members themselves granted that the President had all these powers from the beginning and no additional powers are sought to be taken. As regards the time-limit, it can easily be increased; there is thus no cause for discontent and no need, therefore, to withdraw the Notification issuing the Rules.